

CHAPTER XI.

THE TOWN OF CONCORD.—THE STATE HOUSE ERECTED.—THE TOLERATION ACT, WITH CONSEQUENT SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND TOWN.—MERRIMACK COUNTY FORMED.—OTHER EVENTS IN CHRONOLOGIC ORDER.

1816–1830.

The town house, which had accommodated the general court since 1791, came, after nearly a quarter of a century, to be regarded as quite inadequate to the purposes of a state house. Accordingly, at the June session of 1814, a committee, appointed to consider the subject, reported in favor of building a state house: declaring that all the States of the Union, except New Hampshire, had provided themselves with a state house, and “located a seat of government”; and that it was “derogatory to a respectable and independent State to suffer the officers of its government to sit and transact the business of the State in a building mean in its appearance, and destitute of suitable accommodations.” A committee was thereupon raised, consisting of John Harris, of Hopkinton, Benjamin Kimball, Jr., of Concord, and Andrew Bowers, of Salisbury, to sit during recess, designate a location, prepare a plan, ascertain the probable expense of erection, receive proposals therefor, and report to the next legislature.

As instructed, the committee reported, in June, 1815, a plan, with an estimate of thirty-two thousand dollars for expense of a building of stone, according to an offer made by Stuart J. Park to complete the structure for that sum. The majority of the committee—being the members from Concord and Hopkinton—recommended the proposed building to be located in Concord, near the town house, and in a westerly direction therefrom. The report also announced that the inhabitants of Salisbury would contribute seven thousand dollars if the building should be located in that town. Thus, not so readily as Hopkinton, did Salisbury acknowledge defeat in the contest to become the capital of the state which had been settled in favor of Concord, seven years before. The legislature then appointed another committee to ascertain what appropriation would be made by Concord, or its citizens, should the building be located in accordance with the report just made. The committee found two local parties

of townsmen—the North End and the South End—contending, one against the other. Each party was willing to contribute a satisfactory sum, but to do so only upon condition that its own favorite site for the proposed capitol should be selected. One insisted upon the “Town Hall or Stickney lot;” the other upon a “piece of ground” down town, once belonging to Peter Green, the lawyer, and hence distinguished as the “Green lot.” The North Enders, while making much of the fact that their lot had already been recommended by a legislative committee, contrasted it, as elevated, dry, and commanding a wide prospect, with the other, characterized by them as “low and wet,”—a “quagmire” even,—and needing ruinous expenditure to render it fit for the purposes in view. The South Enders, on the contrary, strenuously insisted upon their lot, maintaining it to be more central, easier of access, and, consequently, more eligible than the “sand heap” of their rivals. This disagreement as to exact site, and the straitened condition of the treasury owing to the recent war, caused the state house question to go over to the next legislature.

A year having elapsed, the legislature, in June, 1816, passed a resolution “that a State House, agreeably to the plan communicated by Stuart J. Park, be erected in the town of Concord; the spot of ground to be selected, and the place on which to erect said State House to be located, by His Excellency the Governor and the Honorable the Council.” The resolution also authorized the governor and council to appoint a committee to make contracts, and to superintend the erection, with instructions to begin the work as soon as practicable, and to employ the convicts at the state prison in hewing the stone. For commencing operations the sum of three thousand dollars was appropriated. These provisions of the resolution were to be of effect only upon condition that the town of Concord, or its inhabitants, should “convey to the State of New Hampshire” a suitable building lot, “level and well prepare” the same, “give all” the necessary stone, and “convey” it to the lot—all to be “performed free of any charge or expense to the State.” Having thus disposed of the matter, without settling the hotly contested question—one rather of local than of public interest—whether the location of the state house should be “north or south of a given line on the main street in Concord,”¹ the legislature, on the 29th of June, adjourned till November. The resolution of 1816, however, fully confirmed that of 1807, whereby the session of 1808 was held in Concord, and really made it the capital of the state.

Within a week after this adjournment, Governor William Plumer

¹ *Life of William Plumer*, cited in *McClintock's New Hampshire*, 542.

and his council proceeded to take action under the legislative resolve. The two contending parties of townsmen had been active in efforts to influence opinion in and out of the legislature; had made liberal subscriptions—that of the South End amounting to four thousand dollars—and now each bound itself to comply with the terms imposed by the legislature, if its favorite site should be selected. On the 3d of July the North End bond was presented to the governor and council by Charles Walker, and that of the South End by William A. Kent and Isaac Hill. One of the councilors, Colonel Samuel Quarles of Ossipee, had leave of absence for that day and was away on private business. The governor and the four remaining councilors, acting as a committee, duly examined lots and proceeded by ballot to make selection; no one objecting to so doing, though the governor asked each of the councilors if he was ready thus to proceed. The “Green lot” was selected by a vote of three to two—the governor and two of the council constituting the majority. The next day, upon the return of Colonel Quarles, who favored the “Stickney lot,” a motion was made to reconsider “the vote of yesterday, selecting a lot of land whereon to erect a State House,” but it failed by the vote of three to three, which clenched the decision of the day before. With a sense of relief, doubtless, did Governor Plumer jot down in his private diary, under date of July 4th, 1816, the brief record, “Fixed the site for the State House.” On the following day the governor and council appointed three Concord men, Albe Cady, William Low, and Jeremiah Pecker, as a committee on contracts and of superintendence, and adjourned till September.

This committee entered upon its duties with commendable promptness. Stuart J. Park, whose original plan of the proposed structure had been approved by the legislature, and whose skill as a builder had been tested in the erection of the state prison, was appointed chief architect, with Levi Brigham, of Boston, for assistant. The entire “plot” of two acres having been purchased as a present to the state, beginning was at once made to prepare it for its new use. Thus, Captain Peter Robertson’s house, standing on the northeast corner, was sold to William Kent, and removed to Pleasant street; the Friend’s meeting-house, occupying another part, was transferred up State street to a location given by Benjamin Hannaford, north of and near the burying ground; and preliminary steps were taken “to level” and otherwise transform the selected site into a park suitable for the state capitol. Moreover, initial steps were forthwith taken towards the actual construction of the building; and the granite, which was to be its material, was soon beginning to be hewn by con-

victs at the state prison, under the special oversight and instruction of John Park Gass, nephew of the chief architect, and afterwards Concord's famous taverner. On the 24th of September, 1816, the corner-stone of the capitol was laid.

Though it could not have seemed probable that, with the work upon the state house and its grounds thus progressing, a change of location could be effected, yet those who had been disappointed at the selection of the site were clamoring angrily thereat all the while till the November session of the legislature. They asserted that a location had never been "made agreeably to the true meaning" of the legislative resolve; since—as they charged—contrary to the intention of the legislature, the governor and council had not, in deciding the matter, voted separately in executive board, but together in committee; and since, too, this action had been taken in the absence of one councilor, contrary to an agreement to await his return. Now, the case was, that with all six present, to act as a committee or an executive board, and with three of the five councilors in favor of the North End lot, the governor could, in executive board, by voting with the minority, in his right to negative the majority, have prevented a selection; but, in the absence of one favoring that lot, the governor would have had no vote in executive board,—there being no majority to negative,—while in committee he had one of the three votes to make up the majority for the South End lot.

During the recess the North Enders succeeded in stirring up considerable feeling in their favor among members of the legislature, so that at the November session an investigating committee was appointed, to whose inquiries the governor replied that he did not understand that any agreement had been made to delay proceedings on account of the absence of Colonel Quarles, and produced clear evidence that there was none, though the three defeated councilors, with less clearness and definiteness of proof, asserted the contrary. The governor also made answer that he and his council, in making the selection, had acted as a committee appointed by legislative resolve, and not in their executive capacity, a statement sustained by a majority of the council. The house of representatives, notwithstanding an adverse report of the investigating committee, sustained the governor, and on the 25th of December, not only killed a resolution to take from the governor and council the power of appointing the building committee, but passed another, by a vote of ninety-one to seventy, appropriating four thousand dollars towards the erection of the building.

Thus discouraged by adverse legislative action, the unprofitable controversy came to an end, and the work of construction went on

undisturbed. By the 18th of July, 1818, such progress had been made that the gilded eagle to crown the dome was raised to its place with public ceremony. A procession having formed in front of the state house, under direction of Major Robertson, passed down State street, and returning entered the capitol, where an address was made by Philip Carrigain. Refreshments were served and toasts were drunk amid cheers and the firing of cannon, with a band, at intervals, playing appropriate airs. Of the toasts, the thirteenth was the climax, and in phrase patriotic enough, albeit somewhat more "spread-eagle" than the six-foot golden image of the bird, with partially expanded wings, upon the dome, ran thus: "The American eagle—May the shadow of his wings protect every acre of our united Continent, and the lightning of his eye flash terror and defeat through the ranks of our enemies."¹

The work went forward to its completion in 1819, with a total expenditure much exceeding the early estimate, and reaching nearly eighty-two thousand dollars, for building, furniture, fencing, preparing the lot, supplying the stone, and hauling the same; the last three items, amounting to four thousand dollars, having been contributed by citizens of Concord. In June of that year the general court commenced its sessions in the new capitol,² and Governor Samuel Bell, in his inaugural message, uttered these words of congratulation: "The splendid public edifice in which you now for the first time assemble will add another honorable testimonial to future ages of the enlightened public spirit and liberal views of the citizens of New Hampshire. It reflects honor upon the Legislature, and upon that enlightened Chief Magistrate under whose auspices it was erected, and who has now retired from an office, the duties of which he has discharged with honor and usefulness."

The next year, the three Concord men, Cady, Low, and Pecker, who constituted the building committee, and had faithfully and successfully performed their responsible duties, were honorably discharged. The comely and convenient edifice, with its pleasant grounds, became an object of interest not only within the state, but in other parts of the country, so that within one year from the 1st of July, 1819, "six thousand eight hundred and seventy-two persons visited it, and were shown its apartments." It was praised by visitors, some of whom had traveled extensively, as "a very elegant stone edifice," and "one of the handsomest buildings in the United States." Praise of the capitol became even an inculcation for early childhood, for in a little educational work, entitled "A Book for New-Hampshire Children, in Familiar Letters from a Father,"—the first

¹ Bouton's Concord, 376.

² See frontispiece in this volume.

of several editions of which was published four years after the completion of the state house,—is found the following description, expressed in simple style to suit “the infant understanding”: “The State House is the grandest building in New Hampshire. It is built of hewn stone, almost as beautiful as white marble. The body of the house is much higher and longer than any meeting-house you ever saw. The windows are of the largest glass, with mahogany sashes. The front of the building has a noble projection and pediment with a large elegant door; and the whole is set off with a most beautiful cupola, with a great gold eagle on the top of it. There is a very large and beautiful yard in front of the State House, with a wide and smooth gravel walk up to it. I have seen many elegant buildings in the course of my life; but I never saw one so elegant as the State House.”

With such appreciation from abroad, and the evident natural tendency of events, the people of Concord themselves might well look with pride upon the capitol, and with satisfying assurance as well, that its erection upon their soil would date a new era of progress and prosperity in the history of the town.

The strife over the location of the capitol had been warmer than the weather in the spring, summer, and autumn months of the year 1816, as the designations, “the cold season” and “the poverty year,” denote. Indeed, it had almost seemed that the polar circle had slipped to the tropic, making of the temperate zone the frigid. This abnormal atmospheric condition prevailed over New Hampshire and the rest of New England. Snow fell in June, and killing frosts came in every month save August. Indian corn could not ripen, the crop of other cereals nearly failed, apples and other fruits came to naught. In consequence, “there was,” as Asa McFarland has recorded, “a real lack of food throughout New Hampshire in the autumn and winter of 1816–17.”¹ Even in Concord there was privation; and the scarcity of provisions, with consequent high prices, caused some suffering among the poor, which the Female Charitable Society, then four years old, contributed to relieve.

The same year the post-office was removed southward from the extreme North End, where it had hitherto been kept by David George, to an ancient building, soon afterwards remodeled into a dwelling by John West, and standing on the west side of Main street, opposite the site subsequently occupied by the Merrimack County bank, and later by the New Hampshire Historical society. The removal was made by Lieutenant Joseph Low, who had come from service in the recent war to dwell in Concord, and had succeeded to the postmastership in

¹ In “An Outline of Biography and Recollection.”

1816. After the completion of the state house, in 1819, he removed the post-office still farther southward to a store on the east side of Main street, opposite the foot of School, on the site of the later Rumford block, and next south of his residence. General Low,—for he became adjutant-general of the state in 1820,—having held the office of postmaster for thirteen years, was succeeded in 1829 by his elder brother, William, who took the office across the street to his own premises on the north side of School street, near its junction with Main. The new quarters became known as the “Old Post-Office Building,” and were occupied by Mr. Low for eleven years, and by later postmasters for a dozen more. Besides these homes the post-office was to find, in the course of years, others at various points between a line at a short distance south of Centre street, and one along the south side of School street—but never, as during the first nineteen years of the century, north of the line of contention between the North End and the South End.

In the spring of 1816 the Republicans had regained control of the state government, and, in the autumn, at the eighth presidential election, they chose electors to cast eight of the one hundred and eighty-three votes which made James Monroe president; Rufus King, the Federal candidate, having received but thirty-four. Concord, however, was still upon the Federal side, and remained there for three years longer.

The suspension of party hostilities in the national field of politics, which generally prevailed during the administration of Monroe, had a pleasant beginning in the president's tour through the Northern states in the summer of 1817. The appropriate demonstrations of honor for the man and his high office which were shown everywhere, and by all, without distinction of party, fitly inaugurated “the era of good feeling.” That tour included Concord in its course, where the president's reception¹ was marked by enthusiastic cordiality, and where he tarried from Friday the 18th to Monday the 21st of July.

The Dartmouth college controversy, beginning in 1815 and continuing until 1819, has more than a passing interest in the history of Concord. Two of its prominent citizens, Thomas W. Thompson and the Rev. Dr. Asa McFarland, of the board of college trustees, were upon one side of the controversy, while, upon the other side, their townsman, Isaac Hill, in his influential newspaper, earnestly supported the cause of those who sought to change the charter of the institution. Politics as well as religious preferences entered into the controversy and kept the question before the people for several years. In 1815 the dissatisfaction long existing, from various causes, between

¹ See description in a special chapter.

John Wheelock, the president of Dartmouth college, on the one part, and the trustees and members of the faculty of that institution on the other, reached an acute stage. The president memorialized the legislature, setting forth his grievances, charging the trustees with improper "acts and operations," and praying that a committee might be appointed "to look into the affairs and management of the institution, internal and external." The legislature, against the strong opposition of the trustees, granted the prayer of the president by a vote of more than two to one. The legislative committee of investigation proceeded to duty, and, on the 16th of August, gave hearing to the contending parties; but only ten days later, and with the legislative inquiry still pending, the trustees removed Dr. Wheelock from the presidency, which he had held for thirty-six years, and chose as his successor the Reverend Francis Brown, only thirty-one years of age, but of sufficient capacity for the position even in days of severest trial.

After this summary action of the trustees, the "College question" soon became a prominent one in the public mind. Its two sides had each strenuous partisans. Upon this new issue which had got into politics, Isaac Hill, the Republican editor of the *Patriot*, and William Plumer, the Republican candidate for governor in 1816, stood together. The openly asserted views of the latter were the views of the Republican party. These were, that, as the college charter of 1769 "emanated from royalty, it contained principles congenial to monarchy"—among others, in having "established trustees, made seven a quorum, and authorized a majority of those present to remove members" considered "unfit or incapable, and the survivors to perpetuate the board by electing others to supply vacancies;"¹ that "this last principle" being "hostile to the spirit and genius of a free government, sound policy" required "that the mode of election should be changed, that trustees, in future, should be elected by some other body of men," and that their number should be increased, so as not only to "increase the security of the college, but to be a means of interesting more men in its prosperity"; that "the college was formed for the public good, not for the benefit or emolument of its trustees, and that the right to amend and improve acts of incorporation of this nature" had "been exercised by all governments, both monarchical and republican."¹ The acceptance of such ideas was promoted by a prevalent impression that the management of the college unduly favored the "standing order," or Congregational denomination.

These views were opposed by the body of Federalists, who maintained that they involved an unconstitutional interference of the state

¹ Governor Plumer's message, June 6, 1816.

with chartered rights of the college and its trustees, impairing the obligations of a contract, such as the charter was;¹ that such interference as came within the scope of Republican views would, if constitutional, "destroy the former corporation, and consequently endanger the funds belonging to the college"; that "the college" was "in a prosperous condition, and no necessity" existed "for any legislative interference whatever"; and that "the inevitable tendency" of such interference was "to make the highest seat of literature and science in the state subject to every change and revolution of party, than which nothing could be more destructive to its welfare."¹

The Republican party having won a complete victory in the state election, the legislature met in June with a majority ready to adopt the recommendations of Governor Plumer upon the college question. On the 27th of June an act was passed to "amend the charter, and enlarge the corporation of Dartmouth College." By this, and a supplementary act passed at the following November session, provision was made for increasing the number of trustees from twelve to twenty-one, and for creating a board of twenty-five overseers; appointments to either board or the filling of vacancies to belong to the governor and council. The name of the corporation was also changed from Dartmouth College to Dartmouth University; and it was also expressly provided that perfect freedom of religious opinions should be enjoyed by students and officers of the university.

Against this enactment Thomas W. Thompson and Asa McFarland had, in behalf of the trustees, presented and urged able remonstrances. Moreover, the idea of establishing a new college at Concord, on principles of the most liberal religious toleration, and under the full control of the state, was favorably entertained by many—an idea which, it had been vainly hoped by the trustees and their friends, might work such a division of sentiment among their opponents in the legislature as would prevent such radical adverse legislation as was actually accomplished in 1816. The idea of creating such a college, and locating it near the center of the state, was to survive the Dartmouth controversy; for in 1822 a law was passed levying a tax of one half of one per cent. upon banking capital to create a Literary Fund for the endowment of such an institution. Some years later, however, or in 1828, the college idea was given up, and the fund, already accumulated or thereafter to accumulate, was ordered to be distributed to the towns for the use of common schools—and thus Concord missed becoming a university town.

In the August following the passage of the college university act, a majority of the old board of trustees, including President Brown,

¹ Protest of minority in house, June 28, 1816.

declined to convene with new members whom the governor and council had appointed to complete the filling of the university board; they also removed William H. Woodward, a fast friend of Dr. Wheelock, from the office of secretary and treasurer, and formally refused to accept the provisions of the recent statute, or in any way to act under it. They were determined not to do anything whereby the college could be construed as merged in the university; for they were reasonably confident that, without their consent, the act of June could not be constitutionally enforced, and such merger wrought. Hence, when a quorum of the university trustees convened, on the 22d of February, 1817, "at the hall, commonly called Masons' Hall, over the Bank, at the southerly end of the Main Street, in Concord, in the county of Rockingham," as the governor expressed it in his summons, Dartmouth college was not represented by trustees or faculty. Whereupon, the university trustees removed by vote President Brown and three other trustees of the college, including Dr. McFarland of Concord, together with two professors, all of whom had refused to appear then and there as summoned. Dr. Wheelock, though lying on his death-bed, and within seven weeks of his end, was elected president of the university, with his son-in-law, Professor Allen, to act in his stead; William H. Woodward was chosen secretary, and the faculty was filled by the choice of two professors, one of whom was Nathaniel H. Carter of Concord. Thus Dartmouth University was organized.

Now, the trustees and faculty of Dartmouth college, upon being cited to appear at the meeting just mentioned, had at once determined to take decisive action towards testing their rights, and the constitutionality of the college act, by bringing suit against their late secretary and treasurer for the recovery of "books of record, original charter, common seal, and other corporate property of the college." Forthwith, they entered in the court of common pleas for Grafton county, at the February term of 1817, their famous action, "The Trustees of Dartmouth College v. William H. Woodward." They temporarily surrendered to the university authorities the college buildings, but they took with them most of the students to other quarters, where was pursued the usual collegiate work for two years, pending the final decision of their case in the supreme court of the United States. That decision came in 1819, reversing that of the highest court of New Hampshire, and declaring the legislation of 1816 in question, unconstitutional, and consequently null and void. Dartmouth university was no more; but Dartmouth college still lived—and would live with a long future of blessing and honor ever opening before her. So ended the controversy which had widely, deeply, and, to some extent, unprofitably, excited the public mind in

New Hampshire; unduly stirring up, by the bitter invective of newspaper and other discussion, personal, political, and religious animosities—to which fact, fortunately, allusion only is necessary here.

Rather, belongs here mention of a gifted son of Concord—the “accomplished scholar and gentleman,”¹ Nathaniel Haseltine Carter—who held the “Professorship of Languages” in the short-lived Dartmouth university. He came to that position at the age of thirty, having been born on the 17th of September, 1787, at the homestead on the Iron Works road, near Turkey river, upon the farm many years later to be named the “Moreland.” His father, Joseph Carter, being a man of some financial means, had been able to assist in gratifying the desire of his son for liberal educational training, academic and collegiate. He had been graduated at Dartmouth in 1811, and then for six years had taught in various places—including his native town—till called to the university. When that institution ceased to exist he removed to the state of New York, where he read law, but soon found journalism more congenial to his finely cultured literary tastes. His newspaper—*The New York Statesman*—which he conducted in Albany and New York city, “under the auspices of DeWitt Clinton”² and other leading men of that day, was eminently distinguished for ability, “candor, and literary merits.”² His reputation as an accomplished writer of prose was enhanced by his two volumes of “Letters from Europe,” embodying the observations of a journey made in the years 1825 and 1826. Moreover, he had poetical genius, and his thought was accustomed to seek expression in verse, the musical and inspired strains of which suggest that he had found a loving muse beside his “native stream”—that “scene,” as he has sung, of his “boyhood’s earliest dream.” In 1824 he, who five years before had been of the faculty of the rival university, delighted Dartmouth college with his thoughtful, elaborate poem, entitled “The Pains of Imagination,” read before the Phi Beta Kappa society of his Alma Mater. This effort, with other poetry, found publication in book form three years later. But his life was not to be long; his winters had to be spent in the sunny Antilles. In the autumn of 1828 Mr. Carter paid his last visit to his native and beloved town, where he was received with cordial welcome and marked respect and honor. Of one incident of that visit, Dr. Bouton, who was then in his early pastoral service, has thus written: “He attended church for the last time in the old North meeting-house, where his pale face, emaciated form, and brilliant eye attracted the notice and awakened the sympathy of the preacher, to

¹ Alumni of Dartmouth College, 152.

² Bouton’s Concord, 585.

him then a stranger.”¹ Again, and in farewell, he trod “the wild and sylvan shore” of the little river, dear to him, and to which, in touching apostrophe, he addressed his finest poem, entitled “To My Native Stream”—a production which has, to the appreciative imagination, cast over the commonplace stream such charm of beauty as only true poetic genius can. Now he had bidden farewell to the home of his childhood and youth, and in the autumn of the next year, by the advice of his physicians, sailed for the south of France. On the second day of January, 1830, soon after his arrival at Marseilles, and in the forty-third year of his age, he breathed the last breath of a life of rich fruition and richer promise.

The question of religious toleration, incidentally arising in the college controversy, had for some time been agitated throughout the state. Under the ancient statute of 1714, virtually reaffirmed in 1791, “the Congregational clergy had been originally settled by the towns or parishes where they preached, and the inhabitants of the towns were all taxed for their support.”² With increase of population and of dissent from the faith and practice of the “standing order,” this system, which had been of good intention and of good results in the earlier days of practical unanimity in religious views, gradually outgrew its usefulness and became oppressive. The scope and intent of the system were to compel attendance upon “the public worship of God on the Lord’s day,” under the preaching of a “settled minister,” to whose salary, agreed upon by a majority in town-meeting, the attendant must contribute in taxation; non-compliance with these requisitions to be tolerated only on proof that one was “conscientiously of a different persuasion,” and “constantly attended public worship according to that persuasion.” Such stringency of requisition, with its growing tendency to provoke resistance, involving burdensome litigation and other harassments, could not but give way before liberal and enlightened thought. The demand for more reasonable legislation slowly grew more and more imperative through the advancing years. At length, in 1816, the Reverend Dan Young of Lisbon, a Methodist minister, and for five successive terms a member of the state senate, presented a bill in that body, repealing the old laws, and providing that houses of worship should be built, and ministers of the gospel hired, exclusively by voluntary association. At that session, and the two annual sessions following, the measure failed of enactment. But the number of its friends steadily increased till, in 1819, it passed in a perfected form presented by Dr. Thomas Whipple, of Wentworth, a leading member of the house of representatives. It passed at the first legislative session held in the

¹ Bouton’s Concord, 585.

² Life of William Plumer, 185.

new capitol, and after as able a discussion as would ever take place within its walls.

This Toleration Act prescribed that all religious denominations in the state might form societies of voluntary membership, having all the corporate powers necessary to raise money by taxes upon the polls and ratable estate of the members for providing houses of public worship and for supporting the gospel ministry. But in consequence of a remarkable unanimity of religious sentiment existing in Concord for long years from the beginning, the compulsory support of the gospel never produced the dissatisfaction and consequent troubles experienced in many other places. Dissent came late, and with gradual and comparatively unaggressive approaches. Denominational uniformity was scarcely rippled by the quiet presence of a small society of Friends that existed here after 1805, and worshipped in its own meeting-house after 1814. It was not until 1816 that Philbrick Bradley opened his house on the "Mountain" to the yet unorganized Methodists for occasional preaching. In course of the two years next preceding the passage of the Toleration Act, two church organizations were effected here—one by the Episcopalians, the other by the Calvinistic Baptists: the former, in 1817, with eighteen members; the latter in 1818, with fourteen. Nor was there any hurry in Concord to dispense with the old system; for it was not till the 9th of March, 1825,—nearly six years after the passage of the Toleration Act,—that the town, at the written request of the Rev. Dr. McFarland himself, then in failing health, annulled by vote his "civil contract with the town," at the end of his twenty-seventh ministerial year. Though thus, after ninety-five years, the town in its corporate capacity ceased to provide for the support of the ministry, yet it voted that "the Rev. Dr. McFarland have leave to cut firewood sufficient for his own use, on the Parsonage land the current year; and also have," for the same time, "the use of the improved lands" belonging to the town. Nearly two years later, on the 18th of February, 1827, came to its end, in its fifty-eighth year, the life of Concord's third minister, so diligently and fruitfully blessing church and town for more than a quarter of a century.

The minister's request that his contract with the town should be closed had been made on the 11th of July, 1824, whereupon a new society was organized under the Toleration Act, on the 29th of the same month, composed of two hundred and twenty-three taxable members—including "nearly all the descendants of the original settlers living in town."¹ During the following autumn, Nathaniel Bouton,

¹ See Change of Constitution, etc., of Society in note at close of chapter.

twenty-five years of age, a native of Norwalk, Conn., a graduate of Yale, and very recently of Andover Theological seminary, served upon invitation seven weeks as a candidate for the pulpit. On the 24th of December he received from the church a unanimous call to become its pastor. This call, having been six days later unanimously concurred in by the society, was accepted; and at a council held on the 23d of March, 1825, the pastoral relation of Dr. McFarland having been dissolved, the Reverend Nathaniel Bouton was ordained to the ministry of the First Congregational Church and Society of Concord—a ministry to continue more than forty years with a church and society whose years would be measured in centuries. But the detailed story of the “Old North,” and of other churches—either of the same or of different faith and practice—for the ensuing three fourths of a century will be told in a special chapter of this history.

The minister’s salary of seven hundred and fifty dollars—being more than twice that which had hitherto been usually paid—indicated that voluntary associated contribution would more liberally support the gospel ministry than would compulsory town taxation—a fact that proved universally true. And it may be worth noting here, that the town had, under the old system, sometimes practically recognized the principle of voluntary contribution in eking out an inadequate ministerial salary. Thus, for years after 1811, in making appropriation to supply the pulpit, about one hundred and fifty dollars were added to the usual three hundred and fifty, with the proviso that “no person be compelled to pay his proportion” of the sum additional.¹

Under the new order of things a committee, consisting of William A. Kent, Joseph Walker, and Abel Hutchins, was appointed in March, 1826, “to take into consideration the subject of selling the interest or right the town” might “have in the meeting-house, to the First Congregational Society in Concord.”² The subsequent report of the committee estimated the town’s interest in the meeting-house at two hundred dollars; in the land on which the meeting-house stood, measuring six rods, north, south, east, and west, to the original reserve for a road, at three hundred dollars; and in the bell, at three hundred dollars. The estimate was accepted, and the town’s interest was accordingly sold to the society for eight hundred dollars.³ The claim of three hundred dollars for the bell was, however, subsequently relinquished; and in 1829 the town ordered the remaining five hundred dollars to be divided among the incorporated religious societies, as was the interest of the Parsonage Fund.

¹ Town Records, 469.

² Town Records (manuscript).

³ Bouton’s Concord, 387.

It will be recollected that along with the original allotment of lands on the west side of the river, in 1726, to the hundred proprietors, special assignments were made for the "Minister," the "Parsonage," and the "School"—each containing a "house-lot" of an acre and a half, and a "home-lot" of six acres, more or less. To the one hundred and three allotments grants were severally made in after years from the common and undivided lands, under such titles as the "Twenty Acres' Division," the "Emendation Lots," the "Eighty Acres' Division," the "Twenty Acres' Grant," and the "Last Division." The "Parsonage" allotment was entirely distinct from the "Ministerial;" and its "house-lot," which, in part, became by lease, in 1820,¹ the site of the schoolhouse in the Eleventh School District, was never occupied as the home of the minister. The Parsonage lands, however, contributed to the support of the ministry. It having now become necessary, under the operation of the Toleration Act, to make some disposition of those lands lying in various parts of the town, a committee was raised in March, 1826, consisting of Joseph Walker, Robert Davis, and Jeremiah Pecker, to sell them, and to secure the proceeds of the sales as a permanent fund—the interest of which should "be applied to the purposes for which said lands were reserved."² Promptly, on the twenty-second of the following April, the committee sold at auction most of the lands³ for \$5,335.61. This sum constituted the original Parsonage fund, but was subsequently increased—mainly by land sold—to \$5,623.01.⁴ In 1828 the town established by vote the following rule for disposing of the interest annually accruing upon the fund: "That the selectmen request each man in town to designate annually the incorporated religious society in Concord, which supports the preaching of the gospel, to which his proportion of the interest of the ministerial fund—according to the amount of his tax on poll and estate—shall be paid; that the selectmen divide the interest accordingly;" and that, in case any persons did not choose to designate to what society their proportion should go, the same should be divided equally among all the societies.

The next year William A. Kent, Robert Davis, and Joseph Low were appointed to invest the principal of the fund in bank or other public stocks, as they should judge it to be for the interest of the town. Thirteen shares of Concord bank stock were taken at \$1,326.25. This was lost, about the year 1840, through the failure of the bank; but with other investments—including a loan to the town of \$3,231.99 on certificates of the selectmen, the fund amounted

¹ Bouton's Concord, 369.

² *Ibid.*, 387.

³ See Sale of Parsonage Lands in note at close of chapter.

⁴ Asa Fowler's Report in Proceedings of Town Meeting, 1851, p. 26.

in 1850 to \$4,296.76.¹ The town loan was subsequently increased to \$3,896.16. Thus the interest upon the fund came from an assumed municipal debt, and reached annually the sum of about two hundred and eighty dollars. This had to be raised by general taxation, and distributed to fifteen or more religious societies, and in sums so small as to be of little benefit. Indeed, the advantage derived hardly compensated the trouble of apportionment—a trouble that was constantly increasing with the influx of new taxpayers and the establishment of new religious societies. Besides, there was reason to doubt the legality and constitutionality of the system that really compelled the taxpayers to contribute to the support of religious societies of which they were not members, and of religious persuasions not their own. It was, therefore, wisely determined, about the year 1875, to dispense with appropriation and distribution under the head of the parsonage fund, and to close all accounts therewith.

When, in 1825, the Toleration Act went into effect in Concord, the population of the town was about three thousand; the census of 1820 counting two thousand eight hundred and thirty-eight inhabitants against two thousand three hundred and ninety-three in 1810, and three thousand seven hundred and two in 1830. Its rank in population was the sixth in the state; Portsmouth, Dover, Gilman-ton, Sanbornton, and Londonderry being in advance. But in the prestige that attracts and the qualities that promote healthy growth and eminent prosperity, the town was second to none. Long a legislative center of the state government, it had now become a judicial one; for in 1823 the county of Merrimack was formed of twenty-three towns severed from the northerly parts of Rockingham and Hillsborough counties, with Concord designated as the shire town. Thus had come, at last, long-desired relief,—especially for the Rockingham towns,—from the inconvenience of attending courts in places so remote as Exeter and Portsmouth. Hopkinton, which had been a half-shire town of Hillsborough county, but was now within the new jurisdiction, retained the old jail till 1852, when the new one was provided within the limits of Concord.²

The citizens of the new county seat, who had given six hundred and twenty-two votes in the affirmative to six in the negative, upon the question of forming the county of Merrimack, were not backward in complying with the terms imposed by the legislature as to providing accommodation for the courts. The following vote was forthwith passed in a special town-meeting: "That the town so far comply with the act of the legislature of June session, 1822, as to remove the town-house back, turn it end to the road, raise it one story, and com-

¹ Asa Fowler's Report in Proceedings of Town Meeting, 1851, p. 26.

² Bouton's Concord, 492.

plete it to the acceptance of the justices of the superior court—provided Mr. Stickney will give the land which may be necessary for this purpose; and provided, also, that one third of the expense of removing and repairing said house be defrayed by individual subscription.”¹ Jeremiah Pecker, Robert Davis, and Joseph Low were appointed superintendents of the work, and eight hundred dollars were appropriated towards carrying it out.¹ Straightway the one-storied structure, which for more than thirty years had served as a town house, and during a part of that period as a state house, was moved westward a short distance up the slope, to stand, in a more eligible location, capped by its second story, and with its modestly colonnaded “end” turned “to the road,” or Main street. The second story accommodated the courts of the new county. The north and south rooms of the first story—as the building originally stood facing eastward lengthwise—now became one town hall. The former of the two rooms, and the larger, had been both a representatives’ and a town hall. It had also been used for other purposes, secular and religious; notably among the latter being the regular Sunday evening services held there in course of the ministry of Dr. McFarland, at which the faithful pastor was accustomed to preach his third sermon for the day, after the delivery of his two stated discourses from the pulpit of the “Old North.”² The other room, or the senate chamber, had also been variously occupied, particularly, however, as it seems, for select schools. Thus, the Reverend Joshua Abbot, a native of Concord, and a son of Captain Joshua Abbot, conducted there, for a few years, a school on the Lancasterian system, as he subsequently did at Norfolk, Virginia, where he died in 1824. Of the system, a Concord pupil, writing in old age, briefly says, “that it combined pleasure with instruction.”³

The one room resulting from the union of the two was to answer the specific purpose of a town hall in the transaction of municipal business for thirty years more, though at an increasing disadvantage, from proving too small to accommodate the steady increase of the voting population. But it answered other purposes, and many. “In this room,” as one has racily said, “were enacted scenes that assumed all the characteristics of the kaleidoscope. It was, emphatically, a free hall. In it were enacted all kinds of transactions, from a free fight to a conference meeting; from a prosy sermon to a violent political harangue. All kinds of religions were inculcated and enforced there. The old hall welcomed all kinds of isms, at all times, upon all subjects, and upon all occasions.”

¹ Bouton's Concord, 370.

² *Ibid.*, 583.

³ Woodbridge Odlin, in *Concord Monitor*, March 28, 1884.

In the new upper room of the building was held, in January, 1824, the first term of the Superior Court of Judicature for Merrimack county—the first, too, of any duly established court of law ever held in Concord. The town supplied one of the justices of that court in the person of Samuel Green, spoken of in an earlier chapter. During the session, an association of the Merrimack County bar was organized, and the event was celebrated by a supper served at the Columbian hotel, then in charge of John P. Gass. This general sketch will not dwell upon the participation of Concord in the doings of bench and bar in that first court house, for thirty years, and thenceforward, in the second, but leaves that subject to be especially treated in its own chapter.

After the war, and in course of the two terms of Monroe's administration, the Federal party became disbanded, and the Republican party was dominant in the state without organized opposition for most of that period. But by 1823 some division had come into the Republican ranks, and at the state election of that year two candidates for governor, one regular and the other irregular, were in the field. Large numbers of former Federalists voted for Levi Woodbury, the irregular nominee, who was elected over Samuel Dinsmoor, the regular. The Republicans of Concord were divided in their support of the nominees, and, as the *New Hampshire Patriot*, then in sole occupancy of the field of political journalism at the capital, was vigorously advocating Dinsmoor's election, Woodbury's friends had determined to have a newspaper to represent their views. Hence, on the 6th of January, 1823, the *New Hampshire Statesman* had appeared.¹ The next year (1824) Judge Woodbury was again a candidate, but, there being no choice by the people, the legislature elected his competitor, David L. Morrill, then of Goffstown, but afterwards of Concord.

The tenth presidential election came in 1824, with its four candidates: John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, William H. Crawford, and Henry Clay—all bearing the Republican name. In Concord, the *Patriot* advocated the election of Crawford, while the *Statesman* and the *Concord Register*,¹ another newspaper recently started by the veteran George Hough, and edited by George Kent and George Kimball, supported Adams, for whom New Hampshire went. Jackson stood highest on the electoral count, with Adams standing next; but the choice of president having been thrown into the national house of representatives, Adams was elected.

During the heated political contest, amid the loud and discordant campaign cries for and against Adams and Crawford, Clay and Jackson, General Lafayette arrived on his last visit to America. In his

¹ See additional particulars in special chapter on Journalism, etc.

triumphal progress through the twenty-four states of the Union, the harsh voices of partisan politics, whenever and wherever the patriot of two hemispheres appeared, became softened and attuned to harmonious acclaims of welcome. His visit to the capital of New Hampshire was an event long anticipated, and for which due preparation had been made by state and town authorities. How the elaborate programme of reception on the 22d of June, 1825, was carried out is specifically told in a special chapter.

In the presidential campaign of 1828, early begun and warmly prosecuted, political parties became more distinctly defined—one, as the Adams, or National, Republican; the other, as the Jackson, or Democratic, Republican. The Adams party contained many that had been Republicans, as against Federalists, under the old classification. For instance, in Concord, such former Republicans as Adjutant-General Joseph Low, Jacob B. Moore,—the latter associated with Isaac Hill in the conduct of the *Patriot* till 1822,—Richard Bartlett, secretary of state, Samuel Sparhawk, cashier of the upper bank, and General Robert Davis, found themselves in party affiliation with such former Federalists as William A. Kent, Stephen and Robert Ambrose, Richard Bradley, Benjamin Gale, Abel, Charles, and George Hutchins. The Jackson party was largely made up of old-time Republicans; of whom in Concord were such as Isaac Hill, William Low, Francis N. Fiske, Abel Baker, Jeremiah Pecker, and Jonathan Eastman. Its newspaper organ was the *New Hampshire Patriot*. The other party was supported by the *Concord Register* and the *New Hampshire Statesman* separately till 1826, when the two newspapers were united. In September of that year, also, Jacob B. Moore, a printer and bookseller, commenced the publication of the *New Hampshire Journal*, that should more definitely represent, than did the *Statesman* and *Register*, the views of such of the Adams party as were not originally Federalists. The new venture in journalism proved a success; and with the business push and editorial ability of the publisher, aided by the capable pen of Richard Bartlett, the *Journal*, with its four thousand subscribers, became the strong antagonist of the *Patriot* in the eleventh presidential contest. The intense heat of that contest was felt in New Hampshire, and especially in its capital. The newspaper press on opposite sides of the taut-drawn party line “gave no uncertain sound”; and the fierce blows dealt were fiercely returned. A corresponding antagonism existed in the community. “I have not known a time,” has written Asa McFarland, “when the people of Concord stood in such hostile attitude on each side the dividing line as in 1827, 1828, and 1829.

. . . There was a cessation of that harmony which has been,

and still is, a delightful element in Concord society, and that causes the name of the city to be in the highest degree appropriate."

Politics developed able journalism; but, outside the newspaper, considerable literary activity was manifested within the last decade of the period under review. This activity took a strong historical turn, yet with many miscellaneous diversions, such as the efforts of Nathaniel H. Carter—already noticed—and the productions in prose and verse of George Kent, Philip Carrigain, Richard Bartlett, and Mary Clark.

In 1821, John Farmer, a native of Chelmsford, Massachusetts, came from Amherst to Concord, at the age of thirty-two, and engaged in business with Dr. Samuel Morril as an apothecary. But the druggist had a genuine aptitude for antiquarian, genealogical, and historical research, in which he labored with conscientious zeal and eminent success. His work was of incontrovertible authority, crowning his life of only forty-nine years with unfading honor. In Concord he found appreciative and congenial companionship. His literary connection was especially close with Jacob B. Moore, "a gentleman of much ability as a writer, well read in general literature,"¹ fond of historical investigation, and a capable printer and journalist. The two, in collaboration, prepared the "Gazeteer of New Hampshire," which was published in 1823, and became the model of many similar productions. The next year, appeared the "Annals of Concord," the pioneer history of the town, prepared by Mr. Moore with important material supplied by Mr. Farmer; the publication having been encouraged by the town in its vote authorizing the purchase of a sufficient number of copies to supply each family with one. Somewhat later, the same industrious collaborators gave to the public their valuable "Historical Collections"—a treasury of antiquarian wealth.

Moreover, John Farmer, Jacob B. Moore, George Kent, and Richard Bartlett attested their literary activity by co-operating with William Plumer, Levi Woodbury, Ichabod Bartlett, Samuel D. Bell, Salma Hale, and other intellectual spirits of that day, in the establishment of the New Hampshire Historical Society, the object of which should be "to discover, procure, and preserve whatever may relate to the natural, civil, literary, and ecclesiastical history of the United States in general, and of" New Hampshire "in particular."² They were of the original thirty-one members of that society, formed at Portsmouth on the 20th of May, 1823, incorporated by the legislature on the thirteenth of the following June, and duly organized, under a constitution, in the council chamber at Concord, on the

¹ Asa McFarland's Address before N. H. Printers' Association, 1872, pp. 39, 40.

² Constitution of the Society.

evening of the very day of incorporation. The society found in Concord not only its permanent home, but also literary talent ready to aid in promoting its worthy purposes. John Farmer became, in 1825, its corresponding secretary, and for the remaining thirteen years of his life, dignified the office by eminent ability of service. All the while, too, he was enriching the Society's Collections with the fruits of diligent research, and doing other important work along his favorite lines of effort, whereby his own fame became widespread and reflected honor upon the society which he loved and served so well, and which was never to lose, in its long succession of membership through future years, the earnest, well-directed literary spirit of its founders.

There was also manifested a growing intellectual interest in the general mind of the community. In 1830 four bookstores existed,¹ providing for school wants, and supplying the larger public demand for miscellaneous reading. A reading-room, supported by the contributions of seventy subscribers, was opened on the 24th of May, 1827, in the second story of a building occupying the site of the later Sanborn's block.² Then there was "The Concord Mechanics' Association," consisting of fifty master mechanics, having a library, in 1830, of nearly one hundred volumes for the use of its members and their apprentices. At the annual meeting of this organization, on the 6th of January of that year, Richard Bartlett delivered an address, and the following list of officers was chosen: George Hough, president; Timothy Chandler and Isaac Eastman, vice-presidents; Jacob B. Moore, treasurer and librarian; Lewis Downing, Benjamin Barker, William Restieaux, and David Allison, directors.³

Literary amusement, in the form of dramatic entertainments,⁴ enlivened Concord in July, 1828,—in the very heat of summer and of a hotter presidential canvass. It was then that Gilbert & Trowbridge of Boston presented a series of plays at "Grecian hall" of the Eagle Coffee House, or at "Theatre Concord," as the bills had it. The plays presented Monday evening, July 28, were Shakespeare's "Othello," and a farce entitled "The Young Widow." The performances were continued during the week, exclusive of Saturday. The company consisted of John Gilbert, Mr. and Mrs. Trowbridge, Mr. and Mrs. Ashley, and two or three others. Gilbert was then only eighteen years of age, and was soon to make upon the boards of the old "Tremont" in Boston his first appearance in regular acting—the debut to a famous career of more than sixty

¹ Directory.

² Bouton's Concord, 202-3.

³ Newspapers; Bouton's Concord, 408.

⁴ See First Dramatic Entertainment, in note at close of chapter.

years upon the stage in Europe and America. The company, having been urged to return in the fall, did so; being, as they announced, "impressed with grateful recollections of the indulgence experienced from their friends and the inhabitants of Concord." This second engagement began on the 17th of November, and continued until the last week in December. The small orchestra was led by the noted violinist, Abraham Pushee, of Lebanon. The leading people of the town very generally gave this experimental theatre their patronage; and strangers dwelling fifty miles away sometimes came to attend it.

Soon after the second theatrical presentation, two home dramatic societies were formed: the "Evergreen Fraternity," composed of lads, and the "Myrtle Wreath," of young men. The theater was, for a time, much in favor. But it had its enemies; for, in 1831, a resolution was adopted in town-meeting "respectfully" requesting "the selectmen not to grant a license permitting any theatrical corps, circus, caravan, or any showmen to exhibit, or to be exhibited, within the limits of the town during" the ensuing year. Historically, however, this sweeping resolution has more interest, as naming the forms of popular amusement then prevalent, than as causing any general or permanent desistance therefrom.

Among the subjects demanding at this period the attention of the the community, the School was prominent, and the public interest therein was healthy and well directed. The annual appropriation increased twenty-five per cent. in the course of fifteen years; rising from one thousand dollars to twelve hundred and fifty. This continued until 1829, to be distributed among the districts, according to the number of scholars between the ages of four years and twenty-one; but in that year the plan was adopted to divide equally a part of the appropriation to aid and encourage "the smaller, less wealthy districts."¹ From this beginning came the settled policy thus to distribute about twenty-five per cent. of the town appropriation, and the whole of the town's annual share of the literary fund.

For years the examination of teachers and the visitation of schools had been *ex-officio* duties of the Rev. Dr. McFarland, as the minister of the town; but in 1818 was chosen for the first time a regular superintending school committee, which consisted of twelve members from different parts of the town, and of whom the minister was one. This practice, or a similar one, continued until the revision of the school system of the state in 1827. The committee, in annual reports, revealed the educational condition of the town, and sometimes made progressive recommendations. One of these the

¹ Bouton's Concord, 391, 393.

town adopted, in 1823, to the effect "that a sum not less than three per cent. of the moneys raised for the support of schools" should "be placed at the disposal of the committee, to be expended," partly, in premiums to schoolmasters distinguishing "themselves for ability and success in instruction and government; and," partly, "in useful books, to be given as rewards of merit to scholars" making "the greatest improvement in their studies." The figures of reported school attendance showed laudable appreciation of school advantages; reaching, in 1823, nearly one thousand, and averaging for some years between one fourth and one third of the whole population.

In the Reverend Timothy Walker's petition¹ presented in 1753 to the "King's Most Excellent Majesty in Council," it was set forth as one of the grievances of the inhabitants of Rumford for which relief was sought, that, being without town privileges they were "not able to raise any moneys for the support of their minister, and the necessary charges of their school and poor." The liability to "charge" for the public support of "the poor" was thus early recognized; though the actual public expense incurred as to pauperism for a long period seems to have been small. In fact, for eighty years after settlement—as found by thorough investigation—only "three different cases of paupers are mentioned in the records," or by tradition. It was not until 1810 that the support of the town's poor began to involve considerable expense with a corresponding increase of public interest in the subject of pauperism. Doubtless one efficient cause of the previous comparative fewness of the town poor had been the enforcement of the state law, whereby persons coming into town without property, and with the liability of becoming a town charge, might be warned to depart, and thus prevented from gaining a residence, with the consequent right to support as paupers. While Judge Walker was of the Court of Sessions for Rockingham county, he took special care that this law should be enforced in Concord.² In 1791 John Bradley, constable, officially reported by name fifteen persons who had come into town during the year from Boscawen, Bow, and Loudon, and whom, "having no estate," he had "warned immediately to depart out of and leave the town."³

From 1813 to 1827 the question how best to deal with pauperism, increasing with growth of population, and from other causes, was not infrequently the subject of careful deliberation and tentative action in town-meeting. It was steadily becoming more and more apparent

¹ Cited in Chapter VI.

² Rev. Mr. Bouton's Commemorative Sermon, 1830, p. 46 (note).

³ Bouton's Concord, 307 (note).

that the long prevalent system of bidding off the poor of the town to whoever would provide for them at the lowest rate was—other considerations waived—not even the most economical. As early as March, 1813, the feasibility of hiring or purchasing “a house to keep the poor in”¹ was considered, and a board of five overseers of the poor was chosen. In June of the same year, Jonathan Wilkins, William A. Kent, John Bradley, Captain Ayer, and Joshua Abbot, Jr., were appointed “to inquire into the expediency of the town’s building or purchasing a house for a Poor House, and to report at the next meeting.”² In March, 1814, the committee were not prepared to report definitely, but recommended that it should be left to the “overseers of the poor or the selectmen to devise the most economical plan for the maintenance of the poor, and to ascertain the expense of a suitable building, and the most eligible situation for it.”³ Again, in 1818 and 1819, the subject was referred to committees, without reaching any practical result; the committee of the latter year reporting in 1820 that in their opinion it was not expedient to make at present any alteration in the mode of supporting the poor.⁴

But the almshouse project, though delayed, was not forgotten. It steadily grew in popular favor, until, at the annual town-meeting of 1827, it received the sanction of these two decisive votes: “That the poor of the town be supported on a farm;” and “That the town will purchase a farm on which the poor of the town shall be supported.” To give practical effect to this action, Timothy Chandler, Stephen Ambrose, Abiel Walker, Abel Hutchins, and Isaac Dow were “authorized and directed to purchase, stock, and put in repair a suitable farm, on which all paupers which this town may be compelled to relieve or maintain may be placed for support.” The selectmen were also instructed to employ a suitable person to have charge of the paupers and farm aforesaid.

The next year the committee reported to the town that they had examined six farms, all of which embraced many advantages for the purpose required; but considering the farm of Mr. Timothy Walker, near the West Parish village, under all circumstances the most profitable, they had purchased it for four thousand dollars. “The farm,” said the committee, “contains over two hundred acres of land, about forty acres of which are good interval; also a number of acres of brook land, which will make good mowing. The land on the west side of the road amounts to about one hundred acres, on which is a large quantity of valuable timber and a great quantity of wood, which, being only two miles from market, must render it very valua-

¹ Town Records, 454.

² *Ibid.*, 462.

³ *Ibid.*, 467.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 516.

ble." The expenditure for stock, repairs, et cetera, added to the purchase price, made the total original cost of the establishment four thousand four hundred eighty-four dollars and fifty-seven cents.

Thus, at last, with Joseph Parker as first on the list of Overseers of the Town Farm, was instituted in Concord a new system of pauper relief and maintenance, more humane and economical than the old, and which was to continue in satisfactory operation for more than fifty years.

NOTES.

Military Facts. On the occasion of President Monroe's visit in 1817, Captain Abbot's cavalry, Captain Samuel Herbert's artillery, and Captain Long's company of infantry did duty on the exercises of reception—a fact denoting that Concord's military organization was not neglected at that date. Nor was it to be neglected in later days. "In 1825 there were," as Asa McFarland has written, "at least seven if not eight military organizations in Concord, as follows: One company of cavalry, in which were from sixty to seventy mounted men; one of artillery, forty to fifty men; a company of light infantry, about forty men; and four companies of militia (men dressed in their every-day apparel), with guns, knapsacks, and cartridge boxes. One of these last named companies was composed of men residing in the center part of the town; another, of those in the southwest part and Millville; a third in West, and a fourth in East, Concord. There was a company known as the Borough riflemen, composed of men living in the northwestern part of the town, including the neighborhood then known as The Borough; but whether all the preceding were then in existence the writer is uncertain. The fields of Mars, in Concord and Pembroke, where these troops made manifest the valor they would have displayed if called into the service of the country, are many. The earliest recollection of a militia muster was upon what was known as the lower interval, in East Concord, sixty or seventy years ago. It was a notable day. Two companies of cavalry, two of artillery, several of light infantry, and ten to fifteen companies of men with arms, but not dressed in uniform, from Canterbury, Loudon, Concord, Chichester, and Pembroke, and men, women, and children, upon the ground in numbers greater even than the troops, were assembled. The exhilarating effect of the spectacle, especially upon young folks, can be readily imagined."

Change of Constitution of First Congregational Society. In 1846 "the taxing system was laid aside and the voluntary subscription plan adopted" for paying "the minister's salary and incidental ex-

penses." *Rev. Dr. Bouton's Commemorative Discourse, March 23, 1865, p. 25.*

Sale of Parsonage Lands. This sale was made as follows: To John Eastman, Jr., eighty acre lot, for \$3,277.70; to Abiel Walker, six acre interval lot, for \$494.47; to Richard Bradley, twenty acre grant, on Little pond road, for \$542.06; five acre interval lot on east side of the river, to William Hurd, for \$357.64; three acre Emendation lot, on Contoocook plain, to Abiel Rolfe and Henry Rolfe, for \$147.34; twenty acre Emendation lot, on Little pond hill, to Henry Chandler and Henry Martin, for \$129.07; Parsonage house lot, near schoolhouse, north end of State street, to Robert Davis, for \$176; Last Division lot, on Beaver meadow, to Abner Farnum, for \$210.50;—the whole amounting to \$5,335.51, which constituted the parsonage fund.

First Dramatic Entertainment. The first dramatic entertainment in Concord was given by amateurs of the town in the town house April 11, 1793. Mr. H. Rogers was manager of the affair. The play was a tragedy entitled "The Revenge." Four days later the Concord *Mirror* said: "This was a virtuous, sentimental, and rational amusement to the respectable inhabitants of the town, and, as it was performed, was certainly an honor to Concord. The characters were as follows: Zanga—Mr. Philip Carragain, Jr.; Alonzo—Mr. Obed Carragain; Alvarez—Mr. Russell; Don Carlos—Dr. I. Sanborn; Manuel—Mr. A. Sanborn; Leonora, the wife of Alonzo, personated by Master John Roche; Isabella, wife to Zanga, by Master J. Chase." For several weeks following, correspondents argued pro and con, in the local newspapers, the question as to the propriety and effect of such entertainments.

OBITUARY.

On the 5th of May, 1822, Timothy Walker, the only son of Concord's first minister, and bearing his name, died at the age of nearly eighty-five years. Born in Rumford, June 27, 1737, graduated at Harvard in his teens, teaching for two years, studying for the ministry and licensed to preach at the age of twenty-two, the young man came to his life-work. But this was not to be done in pulpit or pastorate. He preached occasionally for six years, notably in Rumford, during his father's visit to England in 1762-'63; and there, too, the young minister contributed service as a schoolmaster, at a time when Rumford, deprived of rights as a town, could not regularly raise support for the school. Relinquishing the profession of the ministry he was for some time engaged in mercantile pursuits, and, ere long, had entered upon his public career of varied and honorable service, civil,

military, and judicial, the main features of which have been incidentally depicted in previous narration. He virtually withdrew from public life when, in 1809, he retired from the bench of common pleas, or court of sessions, where he had sat for a quarter of a century,—for the last five years as chief justice. In the historic mansion built and occupied by his father, Judge Walker dwelt in domestic happiness, and, with his wife, Susannah Burbeen, reared to promising maturity his family of ten children. Concord never had a truer or more serviceable friend; he was, indeed, the worthy son of a worthy father.

Captain Benjamin Emery, who died November 2, 1819, at the age of eighty-one, was not a native of Concord, but came hither about 1766. His mother, the wife of Stephen Emery, was Hannah Rolfe, who was the daughter of Henry Rolfe, and sister of Colonel Benjamin Rolfe, both distinguished in the early history of Penacook and Rumford. Captain Emery became prominent, and was called to fill many important civil and military positions. He did good service in the Revolution,—at home, and in the field. He was, in all respects, a strong man, a valuable citizen, and one whose memory deserves special honor.

Lieutenant Richard Herbert came to Concord about 1752. He first engaged in shoemaking, and afterwards in the manufacture of malt. In the Revolution he did duty in the field at Bennington and elsewhere. At home he was of the Committee of Safety for two years. At other times he held offices of trust and responsibility, and was never found wanting. Lieutenant Herbert was noted for his “shrewdness and knowledge of human nature,” often evinced in “original and pithy sayings.” He died July 17, 1823, in the ninety-fourth year of his age.